

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 9-24 are pending in the current application. Claims 1, 10 and 18 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

a. Claims 1-4, 9-11, 14, 15, 17-19, 21-22 and 24

Claims 1-4, 9-11, 14, 15, 17-19, 21-22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Appel in view of Kim. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit neither Appel or Kim, either singularly or in combination, teach or suggest a method for communicating power control information for at least two communication channels, comprising, at least: “transmitting power control information for a forward voice channel to be transmitted from a base station to a mobile station in a portion of a first segment of a reversed pilot channel transmitted from the mobile station to the base station;” as recited in claim 1, and as somewhat similarly recited in claims 10 and 18.

Appel discloses a system and method for dynamically controlling a variable power amplifier. The Examiner alleges that Appel teaches “transmitting power control information for a forward voice/data channel to be transmitted to a base station to a mobile station” in column 6, lines 32-37. However, Appel does not distinguish between a voice channel and a data channel. Instead, Appel teaches a method to “detect and extract from the reverse channel signals one or more power control signals sent back from the mobile units to the base transceiver station 101 in order to control the output power level” (see Appel, column 6, lines 32-35). For at least this reason, Applicants submit that the rejection is improper, as neither Appel nor Kim teach this feature.

The Examiner admits, and Applicants agree, that Appel fails to teach power control information in a portion of a first segment and/or a second segment of a portion of a reverse power channel transmitted from the mobile station to the base station. However, the Examiner alleges that Kim teaches that “a plurality of terminals have a

random access to the reverse common channel system in CDMA” (See paragraph bridging pages 2-3 of Office Action). Kim is directed to an apparatus for making a plurality of terminals have a random access to the reverse common channel of a base station. Kim does not disclose or suggest transmitting power control information for a forward voice channel or a forward data channel. As such, Kim cannot be interpreted, or even reasonably be understood, as teaching transmitting power control information for a forward voice channel (or a forward data channel) in a given portion of a corresponding segment of a reverse pilot channel.

Further, as neither Appel nor Kim teach separate levels of power transmission for the voice channel and the data channel, the Appel/Kim combination is insufficient in rendering independent claim 1 as obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the combination of Appel and Kim fail to teach all the features as recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 18. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus kindly requested.

Claims 2-3, 9, 11, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21-22 and 24, dependent on one of independent claims 1, 10 and/or 18, respectively, are allowable over Appel in view of Kim at least for the reasons set forth above regarding independent claims 1, 10 and 18.

b. Claims 12-13, 16, 20 and 23

Claims 12-13, 16, 20 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appel in view of Ghosh. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that Ghosh is limited to its teachings of various channel types in a CDMA system, and does not cure the deficiencies noted above in Appel. Specifically, Ghosh fails to teach, at least: “transmitting power control information in a portion of the first segment of a reverse pilot channel” and/or “transmitting power control information in a corresponding portion of the second segment of a reverse pilot channel” as recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 18.

Claims 12-13, 16, 20 and 23 are thus allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 10 and 18.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-4 and 9-24 are earnestly solicited.

In the event that any matters remain at issue in the application, the Examiner is invited to contact Matthew J. Lattig at (703) 668-8026 (direct) in the Northern Virginia area, for the purpose of a telephonic interview.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By  45,274

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/MJL/DAP/ybm